



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/607,127

06/26/2003

Angelina McMullin

END903009US1

5527

30400

7590

03/20/2008

HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI P.C.  
5 COLUMBIA CIRCLE  
ALBANY, NY 12203

EXAMINER

BASHORE, WILLIAM L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/20/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/607,127  
Filing Date: June 26, 2003  
Appellant(s): MCMULLIN, ANGELINA

---

Wayne F. Reinke  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed December 17, 2007 appealing from the Office action mailed July 16, 2007.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

20030169295	BECERRA, JR.	9-2003
20020095399	DEVINE ET AL.	7-2002
20030117447	MUJICA ET AL.	6-2003

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 1-14, 19-27, 29-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Becerra, JR. (hereinafter Becerra), U.S. Application Publication No. 2003/0169295, provisional filing March 7, 2002, in view of Devine et al. (hereinafter Devine), U.S. Application Publication No. 2002/0095399 provisional filing August 4, 2000, and further in view of Mujica et al. (hereinafter Mujica) US PG Pub No. US 2003/0117447 filed 12/21/2001.**

**In regard to independent claim 1**, Becerra teaches an electronic tool for the creation of interactive representations of input and output data, and for simulating associated algorithms used to manipulate said data that are used in spreadsheets. The simulation is generated based on data sources within an application program file (spreadsheet data cells). Becerra additionally teaches an interface, using input arrangements (i.e. data arrangements), said arrangements associated with spreadsheet execution, accordingly (Becerra Abstract, Figure 2, also paragraph [0011] – especially at end of said paragraph, and paragraphs [0022], [0023], [0024], [0025]).

It is additionally noted that Becerra does not specifically teach that the spreadsheet itself is to execute its logic. However, Devine teaches a spreadsheet statistical reporting method whereby a spreadsheet executes internal statistical calculations on inputs (Devine paragraph [0449]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Devine to Becerra, providing Becerra the benefit of well known statistical test methods by the spreadsheet to confirm Becerra's analyzed spreadsheet algorithms (see also Devine paragraph [0449] – at

middle). It is further noted that both references are in the same general field of endeavor (calculating spreadsheet reports). Compare the above with “*A method of facilitating development of programs, said method comprising; providing an interface of a program; and including in the program a spreadsheet that is to execute logic of the spreadsheet in response to data of the interface,...*”.

Becerra teaches selecting one or more data cells in a pre-existing spreadsheet file (Becerra paragraph [0010] – at bottom). Becerra does not specifically disclose a spreadsheet which is “*unchangeable*” by a user. However, Mujica teaches a spreadsheet application comprising the ability of a user to lock either an individual cell or a group of cells (i.e. all cells of a spreadsheet), thereby locking spreadsheet changes (Mujica paragraphs [0004], [0017]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Mujica to Becerra, providing Becerra the benefit of creating a program with locked cells therefore ensuring better data security.

Becerra teaches displaying output (Becerra Figures 2-5).

**In regard to dependent claim 2**, Becerra does not specifically teach hiding a spreadsheet program. However, Devine teaches running a spreadsheet “hidden” (Devine paragraph [0549]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Devine to Becerra, providing Becerra the benefit of hiding a spreadsheet for increased security (e.g. for service deliveries only).

**In regard to dependent claim 3**, Becerra does not specifically teach that the spreadsheet avoids re-coding. However, Devine teaches running a spreadsheet “hidden” (Devine paragraph [0549]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Devine to Becerra, providing Becerra the benefit of hiding a spreadsheet for increased security (e.g. for service deliveries only, and therefore avoids re-coding).

**In regard to dependent claim 4**, Becerra teaches creating an interface based upon a spreadsheet (Becerra paragraph [0010]).

**In regard to dependent claim 5**, Becerra teaches creating interactive representations of (spreadsheet) input and output data (Becerra Abstract, Figure 5). Becerra does not specifically disclose input and results “tabs”. However, Becerra’s teaching of Sheet tabs (Becerra Figure 4 – at bottom) to differentiate between spreadsheets, provides reasonable suggestion to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply “tabs” to input and result sections, facilitating differentiation between input and result data.

**In regard to dependent claims 6, 7, 8**, Becerra teaches creating input components and selecting ranges, so as to facilitate interaction with Becerra’s

spreadsheet (Becerra paragraph [0010], Figure 2). It is noted that these input components provide association data to the spreadsheet.

Becerra does not specifically teach prior checks and tasks. However, Devine teaches a spreadsheet statistical reporting method whereby a spreadsheet executes internal statistical calculations on inputs (Devine paragraph [0449]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Devine to Becerra, providing Becerra the benefit of well known statistical test methods by the spreadsheet to confirm in advance Becerra's analyzed spreadsheet algorithms (see also Devine paragraph [0449] – at middle).

**In regard to dependent claim 9**, Becerra does not specifically teach that the output data is from the spreadsheet itself. However, Devine teaches a spreadsheet statistical reporting method whereby a spreadsheet executes internal statistical calculations on inputs (Devine paragraph [0449]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Devine to Becerra, providing Becerra the benefit of well known statistical test methods by the spreadsheet to confirm in advance Becerra's analyzed spreadsheet algorithms by providing output data from said spreadsheet (see also Devine paragraph [0449] – at middle).

**In regard to dependent claims 10, 11**, Becerra teaches formulas to be applied to input data (Becerra paragraph [0011]). Becerra teaches results (Becerra Figure 5).



**In regard to dependent claim 12, 13,** Becerra does not specifically teach exclusive input/output access to the spreadsheet. However, Devine teaches a user logon and other authentication procedures for identification of authorized member users (Devine paragraph [0495]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Devine to Becerra, providing Becerra the benefit of exclusive input/output, ensuring greater security.

**In regard to dependent claim 14,** Becerra teaches an initial setup of graphical slider controls associated with input cells. Calculations are replaced as input values change (via slider), without rearrangement (re-coding) of the interface (Becerra paragraph [0042]).

Becerra teaches selecting one or more data cells in a pre-existing spreadsheet file (Becerra paragraph [0010] – at bottom). Becerra does not specifically disclose a spreadsheet which replaces calculations by other than the user. However, Mujica teaches a spreadsheet application comprising the ability of a user to lock either an individual cell or a group of cells (i.e. all cells of a spreadsheet), thereby locking spreadsheet changes (Mujica paragraphs [0004], [0017]). It is noted that the claimed “other” user can be the programmer with the power to change, replace, and lock accordingly, preventing all future users from editing. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Mujica to Becerra, providing Becerra the benefit of creating a program with locked cells therefore ensuring better data security.

**In regard to independent claim 19**, Becerra teaches an electronic tool for the creation of interactive representations of input and output data, and for simulating associated algorithms used to manipulate said data that are used in spreadsheets. The simulation is generated based on data sources within an application program file (spreadsheet data cells). Becerra additionally teaches an interface, using input arrangements (i.e. data arrangements), said arrangements associated with spreadsheet execution, accordingly (Becerra Abstract, Figure 2, also paragraph [0011] – especially at end of said paragraph, and paragraphs [0022], [0023], [0024], [0025]). Compare with *“A method of facilitating development of programs, said method comprising; providing an interface of a program; and including in the program a spreadsheet that is to execute logic of the spreadsheet in response to data of the interface,...”*.

It is additionally noted that Becerra does not specifically teach that the spreadsheet itself is to execute its logic. However, Devine teaches a spreadsheet statistical reporting method whereby a spreadsheet executes internal statistical calculations on inputs (Devine paragraph [0449]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Devine to Becerra, providing Becerra the benefit of well known statistical test methods by the spreadsheet to confirm Becerra's analyzed spreadsheet algorithms (see also Devine paragraph [0449] – at middle). It is further noted that both references are in the same general field of endeavor (calculating spreadsheet reports).

Becerra teaches selecting one or more data cells in a pre-existing spreadsheet file (Becerra paragraph [0010] – at bottom). Becerra does not specifically disclose a spreadsheet which is “*unchangeable*” by a user. However, Mujica teaches a spreadsheet application comprising the ability of a user to lock either an individual cell or a group of cells (i.e. all cells of a spreadsheet), thereby locking spreadsheet changes (Mujica paragraphs [0004], [0017]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Mujica to Becerra, providing Becerra the benefit of creating a program with locked cells therefore ensuring better data security.

Becerra teaches displaying output (Becerra Figures 2-5).

**In regard to dependent claims 20-25, 27**, claims 20-25, 27 reflect the system comprising computer readable instructions used for performing the methods as claimed in claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claim 26**, claim 26 reflects the system comprising computer readable instructions used for performing the methods as claimed in claims 12, 13, and is rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to independent claim 29**, Becerra teaches an electronic tool for the creation of interactive representations of input and output data, and for simulating associated algorithms used to manipulate said data that are used in spreadsheets. The simulation is generated based on data sources within an application program file

(spreadsheet data cells). Becerra additionally teaches an interface, using input arrangements (i.e. data arrangements), said arrangements associated with spreadsheet execution, accordingly (Becerra Abstract, Figure 2, also paragraph [0011] – especially at end of said paragraph, and paragraphs [0022], [0023], [0024], [0025]). Compare with *“A method of facilitating development of programs, said method comprising; providing an interface of a program; and including in the program a spreadsheet that is to execute logic of the spreadsheet in response to data of the interface,...”*.

It is additionally noted that Becerra does not specifically teach that the spreadsheet itself is to execute its logic. However, Devine teaches a spreadsheet statistical reporting method whereby a spreadsheet executes internal statistical calculations on inputs (Devine paragraph [0449]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Devine to Becerra, providing Becerra the benefit of well known statistical test methods by the spreadsheet to confirm Becerra's analyzed spreadsheet algorithms (see also Devine paragraph [0449] – at middle). It is further noted that both references are in the same general field of endeavor (calculating spreadsheet reports).

Becerra teaches selecting one or more data cells in a pre-existing spreadsheet file (Becerra paragraph [0010] – at bottom). Becerra does not specifically disclose a spreadsheet which is *“unchangeable”* by a user. However, Mujica teaches a spreadsheet application comprising the ability of a user to lock either an individual cell or a group of cells (i.e. all cells of a spreadsheet), thereby locking spreadsheet changes (Mujica paragraphs [0004], [0017]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art at the time of the invention to apply Mujica to Becerra, providing Becerra the benefit of creating a program with locked cells therefore ensuring better data security.

Becerra teaches displaying output (Becerra Figures 2-5).

**In regard to dependent claims 30-35, 37**, claims 30-35, 37 reflect the product comprising computer readable instructions used for performing the methods as claimed in claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claim 36**, claim 36 reflects the product comprising computer readable instructions used for performing the methods as claimed in claims 12, 13, and is rejected along the same rationale.

#### **(10) Response to Argument**

Beginning on page 9 of the appeal brief (hereinafter the brief), Appellant argues the following issues which are accordingly addressed below.

**a. Appellant argues that the references of record constitute non-analogous art, and are therefore improperly cited against the present application (pages 9-12 of the brief).**

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Becerra teaches an electronic tool for the creation of interactive representations of input and output data, and for simulating associated algorithms used to manipulate said data that are used in spreadsheets. Becerra clearly teaches development of programs, since visual components are manipulated and associated with (spreadsheet) data sources, producing a program to achieve customized results (see also Becerra Figure 1). Becerra develops a program(s) for creating custom animations of spreadsheet data that run on a Flash player. It is worth noting that Becerra paragraph [0036] and [0037] teaches binding components to spreadsheet cells. For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that Becerra is within the same general field of endeavor as Appellant's invention.

Appellant argues that Becerra is not reasonably pertinent to the problem Appellant's invention seeks to solve. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Becerra uses spreadsheet data, along with mathematical formulas that simulate spreadsheet functionality, to create a customized program for display. Although paragraph [0011] of Becerra does mention a simulation, Becerra still relies on a spreadsheet program to create the underlying algorithms and mathematical relationships. Since representative claim 1 recites that a "spreadsheet" is "included" within the program, secondary reference Devine is used to teach a spreadsheet statistical reporting method whereby a spreadsheet executes internal statistical calculations on inputs. This teaching is applied to Becerra, providing Becerra the benefit of including a spreadsheet to utilize well known statistical test methods by the spreadsheet, so as to confirm Becerra's analyzed

spreadsheet algorithms. As stated in the instant rejection of claim 1, both references are in the same general field of endeavor (calculating spreadsheet reports). For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Becerra is pertinent to the problem at hand.

Appellant substantially applies the same analysis to secondary reference Devine. The examiner respectfully disagrees. As stated above, Devine is used to teach a spreadsheet executing internal statistical calculations on inputs, and is applied to Becerra accordingly. Both references deal with spreadsheet reporting.

Regarding tertiary reference Mujica, this reference is used to teach representative claim 1 "*wherein the spreadsheet of the program is unchangeable by a user*" (emphasis added). Mujica locks individual cells of a spreadsheet, therefore said cells are unchangeable by users.

b. **Appellant submits there is no teaching, suggestion or motivation to put a spreadsheet into the Becerra animation, if it could even be done (page 13 of the brief).**

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Becerra uses spreadsheet data, and generates mathematical formulas which simulate spreadsheet functionality. Devine's spreadsheet is applied to Becerra so as to provide a test of the accuracy of the

generated formulas, and/or to give a user a choice between the spreadsheet itself or its mathematical simulation.

**c. Appellant argues that applying Mujica to Becerra would go against the teaching of Becerra (page 13 of the brief).**

The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner interprets the term “user” within representative claim 1 as a human user, therefore a human user would not be able to change Devine’s spreadsheet as applied to Becerra’s invention. In any event, even if Appellant’s analysis is to be adopted (the examiner is not admitting this), there is no reason why it would not be possible (or reasonable) for the skilled artisan to restrict Becerra’s input range accordingly.

**d. Appellant argues that applying Devine’s hidden spreadsheet into Becerra would make no sense in view of the teachings of Becerra (page 14 of the brief).**

The examiner respectfully disagrees. There is more to Becerra’s invention than the simulation result. Becerra teaches that various components are arranged on a canvas for creating a program, etc. (see Becerra Abstract and Figures 1-5). Devine’s spreadsheet can be made available during the design phase. In addition, since there is



no reason why a spreadsheet cell display cannot be displayed as part of a final flash simulation, Devine's teaching would render the option of hiding said spreadsheet accordingly. It is respectfully noted that instant claim 2 merely recites that the spreadsheet of the program is hidden from a user. Devine does this and is applied to Becerra accordingly.

**e. Appellant argues that Devine does not teach the limitations of instant claim 3 (pages 14-15 of the brief).**

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Becerra does not specifically teach that the spreadsheet avoids re-coding. However, Devine teaches running a spreadsheet "hidden". By keeping the service workbooks hidden, a user cannot change the spreadsheet, therefore said spreadsheet cannot be re-coded with new data and/or formulas.

Claim 3 recites in pertinent part "*...avoids re-coding of the logic of the spreadsheet.*". The examiner interprets this as the spreadsheet's logic itself that cannot be re-coded, or changed. Becerra's algorithms and mathematical formulas may be imported (replicated) from a spreadsheet into a control panel file, but the logic of the spreadsheet itself is not altered.

- f. **Appellant argues that Becerra does not teach instant claim 5 (pages 15-16 of the brief).**

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Becerra's final simulation involves display of spreadsheet tabs during at least the design phase. Since spreadsheet tabs (and tabs in general for marking data) were well established at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to apply the design phase tabs for use in the result, providing organization to data of interest.

- g. **Appellant argues that Becerra does not teach instant claim 6 (page 16 of the brief).**

The examiner respectfully disagrees. As explained in the instant rejection, Becerra teaches creating input components and selecting ranges, so as to facilitate interaction with Becerra's spreadsheet. It is noted that these input components provide association data to the spreadsheet.

Although Appellant asserts that Becerra's interaction is not the same as the claimed "interaction", claim 6 does not elaborate on this specific term. Absent clarification within claim 6, there is nothing within said claim which would preclude the examiner from the interpretation adopted within the instant rejection.

h. **Appellant argues that Becerra does not teach instant claim 7 (page 17 of the brief).**

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Becerra teaches creating input components and selecting ranges, so as to facilitate interaction with Becerra's spreadsheet (Becerra paragraph [0010], Figure 2). It is noted that these input components provide association data to the spreadsheet.

i. **Appellant argues that Becerra does not teach instant claim 14 (page 18 of the brief).**

The examiner respectfully disagrees. As explained in the instant rejection, Becerra teaches an initial setup of graphical slider controls associated with input cells. Calculations are replaced as input values change (via slider), without rearrangement (re-coding) of the interface.

Becerra teaches selecting one or more data cells in a pre-existing spreadsheet file. Mujica is used to teach a spreadsheet which replaces calculations by other than the

user. It is worth noting that the claimed "other" user can be a programmer with the power to change, replace, and lock accordingly, preventing all future users from editing.

**(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

William L. Bashore  
March 15, 2008

/William L. Bashore/  
William L. Bashore  
Primary Examiner  
Tech Center 2100

Conferees:

Doug Hutton (SPE 2176)

*/Doug Hutton/*  
Doug Hutton  
Supervisory Primary Examiner  
Technology Center 2100

Stephen Hong (SPE 2178)

/Stephen S. Hong/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2178